



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a series of eight lectures. The commendable points about his work are (1) the clear and vigorous style of his presentation; (2) his evidently thorough study of the whole field in the latest and best available literature. What makes his book, in spite of these merits, no more than a common-place apologetic, with a little fuller and fresher information than others of the kind, is that he omits or glosses over difficulties produced by archæological discoveries, and conveys the impression thereby that archæology not only everywhere vouches for the historical accuracy of the biblical narratives, but does this in a direct and convincing way. Between Dr. Nicol's lectures and Professor Driver's chapter in *Authority and Archæology* there is no comparison. Our author seems to have sacrificed exactness of treatment to the necessities of making an impression upon his auditors. Of course, this is not in any way to intimate that the author is not expressing his real convictions. But objectively considered the treatment is inadequate.—G. S. GOODSPEED.

*Die Schöpfungsgeschichte, der Sündenfall und der Turmbau zu Babel*, in drei im akademischen Gottesdienst zu Halle gehaltenen Predigten behandelt. Von Dr. F. Loofs. Hefte zur *Christlichen Welt*, No. 39. (Freiburg in B.: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1899; pp. 42; M. 0.75.) Dr. Loofs does not make any attempt in these sermons to defend the literal interpretation of the Mosaic accounts of creation, the fall of man, and the building of the tower of Babel. He finds in these accounts, however, valuable truths which, he says, Protestant clergymen ought to preach. For example, the biblical account of creation recognizes the transcendence of God; the fall of man teaches that sin is not from God; the story of the tower of Babel points out the lesson that even in the earliest years of history costly temples were erected chiefly to commemorate the skill of their builders or their patrons.—A. J. RAMAKER.

*Proverbia-Studien zu der sogenannten salomonischen Sammlung C. x-xxii, 16*, von Dr. H. P. Chajes (Berlin: Schwetschke & Sohn, 1899; pp. vii + 46; M. 1.60), is an attempt to find in the chapters named traces of an original alphabetic arrangement of the proverbs. The author has carefully collected and arranged the separate proverbs according to the initial Hebrew letter. He has gone farther and arranged each list under a given letter in accordance with the alphabetical order of the *second* letter. This scheme reveals some striking facts for the

author's theory. He finds, for instance, that the *Aleph* lines number 38, the *Beth* 39, the *Gimel* 12, the *Daleth* 6, the *He* 15, the *Waw* none at all, the *Zayin* 5, the *Qoph* 5, and the *Samekh* only 1. The great diversity in the number of lines found under the different letters does not uphold the theory of the author. Again, when we test this arrangement by the thought of the proverbs thus thrown together, we fail to find sufficient evidence for an original, mechanical alphabetical arrangement.—IRA M. PRICE.

*Le Saint-Sépulcre depuis l'origine jusqu'à nos jours et les Croisés du Maine*: essai historique. Par A. Legendre, professeur d'archéologie biblique et d'Hébreu à l'Université catholique de l'Ouest. Avec photographies, plans et gravures. (Le Mans: Imprimerie Librairie Leguicheux et Cie., 1898; pp. 116.) The author gives a connected historical sketch to show that the traditional holy places are incontestably authentic.

He enlarges particularly upon the time of the crusades, introducing at length a notable list of Mayenne names of crusaders; in part the more completely to fill out his outline, in part also for patriotic and local reasons. He thus writes primarily for his countrymen and neighbors, though of course for true Catholics everywhere.

The effort is didactic, never apologetic. No other possible site is even suggested. It is taken for granted that the question is forever settled. At the same time the book shows scholarly care coupled with much religious earnestness, and is therefore readable. The underlying desire is to awaken added reverence for the holy places of the church, and secondarily to revive honorable ancestral distinctions. This endeavor to assure to prominent family names the glory of a great ancestry is found in much other recent French historical literature.

From the Protestant point of view the site of the holy sepulcher and of Calvary is still unsettled. And yet controversy has largely ceased, and in its place has come a patient waiting for light through further excavation. The supposed identification of the remains of the lost Second Wall has induced many Protestants to accept the traditional site. A most noteworthy example is the distinguished Baurath C. Schick, of the Deutsche Palaestina-Verein. For thirty-seven years in the midst of persistent archæological inquiry, chiefly in Jerusalem itself, he held steadily to another site; then, compelled by later discoveries which in his view located more exactly the basilica of Constantine, he adopted the traditional view.